

### C. REMARKS

#### *A. CLAIM AMENDMENTS*

Claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 11 have been amended.

Claims 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10 have been rewritten in independent form.

Claim 1 has added the limitation “siloxane” to coating agent. Support for this amendment can be found in paragraph 39 among other places.

Claim 11 has been amended to include the limitation that “within a combustion zone”. Support for this amendment can be found in paragraphs 0043 and 0048 and Figure 1 among other places.

#### *B. CLAIM REJECTIONS*

##### *35 U.S.C. § 102*

Claims 1-3, 11, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ashworth *et al.* U.S. Patent No. 5,967,061 (“‘061”).

In order for a claim to be anticipated, a single piece of prior art must show all of the claimed elements. *W.L. Gore & Assocs. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 712 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

Claim 1 has been amended to include siloxane as the coating agent. '061 does not disclose this limitation. Claim 1 is not anticipated by Ashworth and, therefore, should be allowable.

Claim 11 has been amended to include "within a combustion zone". '061 does not disclose this limitation. Claim 11 is not anticipated by Ashworth and, therefore, should be allowable.

Claim 12 is dependent on claim 11 and, therefore, should be allowable. Claim 14 is dependent on claim 11 and, therefore, should be allowable.

Claims 4-10 and 22 were rejected as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claims 4-10 and 22 were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent format. Claims 4, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10 have been rewritten in independent format and, therefore, should be allowable. Claim 7 is dependent on claim 6 and, therefore, should also be allowable because it is not dependent on a rejected base claim.

Claim 22 is dependent on claim 1 and because there is a new limitation on claim 1, it should also be allowable.

*35 U.S.C. 112 Rejection & Claim Objection*

Claim 22 was objected to because it was a repeat of claim 5. Claim 22 now is different from claim 5.

Claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claim 21 has been cancelled.

*C. CONCLUSION*

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims presented in the application are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the claims are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

*John C. Thomas III 18-11-05*

John C. Thomas III  
Reg. No. 52,282  
Paul A. Beck & Associates, P.C.  
Suite 100, 1575 McFarland Road  
Pittsburgh, PA 15216-1808  
Phone (412) 343-9700  
Fax (412) 343-5787  
Customer No. 09961